

# County of Roanoke



## **FY2005-2006 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Review Committee**

Evaluation and Recommendations  
January 2005

# Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

## Table of Contents

I.	<b>Committee Appointments .....</b>	1
II.	<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	2
III.	<b>Capital Project Recommendations</b>	
	Capital Project Prioritization .....	4
	Project Score Summary – By Category .....	6
	Recommendations.....	8
	Footnotes on Specific Projects .....	11
IV.	<b>Appendix</b>	
	Committee Goal & Objectives .....	A1
	Project Evaluation Criteria .....	A2
	Evaluation Scoring Factors .....	A3
	General Committee Comments.....	A4
	Project Specific Comments .....	A5
	Project Score Summary – Category Breakdown.....	A6
	Project Score Summary – Cost Breakdown .....	A7

## Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

### Committee Appointments

In developing the FY2006-2010 Roanoke County CIP, the Board of Supervisors approved a CIP Review Committee comprised of Board-appointed representatives for each magisterial district and members of County-appointed commissions and boards. This unique approach allows a diverse perspective in reviewing and prioritizing capital needs that exist throughout the county. The FY2005-2006 CIP Committee is comprised of the following appointed members:

<b><u>Appointment:</u></b>	<b><u>Representing:</u></b>
Ms. Pam Berberich	Cave Spring Magisterial District
Mr. Jason Perdue	Hollins Magisterial District
Mr. Michael Roop	Vinton Magisterial District
Ms. Barbara Bushnell	Windsor Hills Magisterial District
Mr. Craig Sharp	Industrial Development Authority
Ms. Sherry Ricci	Library Board
Mr. Rodney McNeil	Planning Commission
Mr. Todd Selkirk	Public Safety
Mr. Jack Griffith	Parks and Recreation Commission

#### **Facilitated by Roanoke County Staff:**

Mr. W. Brent Robertson	Director, Management and Budget
Mr. Chad Sweeney	Budget Administrator
Ms. Cathy Tomlin	Budget Analyst

# Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

## Executive Summary

January, 2005

### **Background**

A Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is a multiyear management and fiscal planning tool to assist in financing and constructing public improvements. The Board of Supervisors selected a committee of citizens to evaluate and prioritize submitted capital projects and make recommendations for Board consideration in the capital planning process. The Committee agreed upon guiding principles, goals, and objectives (listed in Appendix); then interviewed departmental staff and conducted site visits to understand specific projects. Members committed approximately 35 hours to the evaluation, prioritization, and reporting process.

It is important to note that the scope of the CIP Review Committee's evaluation did not include the capital needs of the Roanoke County school system.

### **Results of Evaluation**

The Committee prioritized capital project requests by applying a set of evaluation criteria to each individual project. The Committee used 12 separate criterion to score projects using values important to the community that were derived from previously adopted plans, policies (i.e. Community Plan), and statements articulated by the Board of Supervisors.

After scoring was completed by committee members, each project's average score was calculated and listed in numerical order with the highest score representing the greatest priority. This listing was then presented in groupings based on natural "breaking points" in the average scores. The Level 1 projects represent needs that have the highest perceived community value. The Committee has identified Level 1 capital projects as follows:

- Sheriff – Regional Jail Project
- General Services – New Garage at Kessler Mill
- Public Safety – 800 MHz Radio System Upgrade
- Community Development – VDOT Revenue Sharing
- Fire & Rescue – EMS Data Reporting
- Library Services – South County Library
- Park & Recreation – Garst Mill Park Improvements
- Information Technology – Replacement of HP/3000 Platform

The complete listing of prioritized projects follows the Executive Summary.

### **Committee Recommendations**

While charged with developing a citizen-based prioritization of existing capital needs, the Committee also discussed and reached consensus on a number of capital programming recommendations for the Board to consider:

- **Capital Financing.** In order to meet on-going capital needs a significant, recurring funding stream is essential.
  - *Dedicated Funding*—current allocations for capital expenditures should be increased to realistically meet current and future capital requirements.
  - *Debt Financing*—Consider the possibility of a future General Obligation Bond issue to meet critical capital needs, increasing flexibility for current operational concerns.
- **Capital Maintenance.** Continue to increase the funding of capital maintenance to a level that will not only protect the County’s current capital investments, but will also reduce future capital requests (as deferred maintenance grows into capital needs).
- **Long Range Capital Planning.** Integration of planning processes must occur to adequately plan for capital needs of the community over the 5 year window of the CIP. In addition, funding should be identified over the 5 year period that indicates a fully developed CIP, not just a wish list of projects.
- **Land Banking.** This idea would involve projecting capital needs into the future and then acquiring sites that would be used to locate future capital facilities.
- **Departmental Master Planning.** Roanoke County has undergone significant demographic and service demand changes, and these changes are anticipated to continue into the future. As a result, the Committee suggests several departments prepare or update a facilities master plan in order to clarify future capital needs in their area of responsibility.

### **Committee Ranking by Category**

The ranking of individual projects was determined by over-all average score, where the highest score was the top ranked project and the lowest score was the bottom ranked project. Knowing the scoring criteria gives greater weight to community “needs” (i.e. public safety ) when compared to community “wants” (i.e. library or parks and recreation), the Committee’s opinion was that a healthy community provides its citizens with a good mix of both wants and needs. Page 9 of the report presents ranked projects in 4 categories: Public Safety, Technology, Quality of Life, and Service Infrastructure.

### **Individual Committee Member Comments**

Information presented in the Capital Project Prioritization report represents the general consensus of the members of the CIP Review Committee. While consensus information related to the Committee’s task is presented, Committee members’ individual comments about specific projects and capital planning in general are included in the Appendix.

# Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

## Capital Project Prioritization

Using the Committee's adopted evaluation criteria, total project scores were averaged and listed in descending order. The projects are presented in groupings based on the natural breaking points (scoring average), with Level 1 representing projects that have the greatest community value, as determined by applying the established criteria to each project. Succeeding levels were determined by grouping projects together that had successively lower scores; thus the project represents a need that is perceived to have less community value than projects with higher scores. The Committee's recommendations on capital priorities are as follows:

Department – Project	Average Total Score	Total Capital Cost
<b>Level 1:</b>		
Sheriff - Regional Jail Project	89.0	\$20,000,000
General Services - New Garage at Kessler Mill Road	77.1	\$1,180,000
Public Safety - 800 MHz Radio System Upgrade	75.4	\$14,000,000
Community Development - VDOT Revenue Sharing	73.8	\$2,500,000
Fire Rescue - EMS Data Reporting System	72.3	\$145,000
Library - South County Library	71.1	\$13,078,000
Parks & Recreation - Garst Mill Park Improvements	69.8	\$230,000
Information Technology - Replacement of HP/3000	68.3	\$1,000,000
<b>Level 2:</b>		
Parks & Recreation - Parks & Recreation Land Bank	64.3	\$975,000
Library - Glenvar Library Expansion	63.3	\$2,130,000
Fire Rescue - New City/County Co-Staffed Station	62.4	\$900,000
Economic Development - Center for Research Technology	62.3	\$5,750,000
Parks & Recreation - Brambleton Center	61.4	\$375,500
Community Development - Regional Storm Water Mgt/Flood Control	61.3	\$7,500,000
Library - Mt. Pleasant Library Relocation	61.0	\$801,750
Community Development - GIS Phase II – Integration	60.4	\$100,000
Parks & Recreation - Brookside Park	60.0	\$217,000
<b>Level 3:</b>		
Library - Vinton Library Renovation	58.8	\$857,000
Parks & Recreation - Burton Softball Complex	58.7	\$355,000
Police - South County Police Precinct	57.8	\$265,000
Fire Rescue - New Oak Grove Station	57.8	\$2,000,000
Fire Rescue - Back Creek Station Addition	57.1	\$330,000
Library - Bent Mountain Library Expansion	56.9	\$128,500
Greenway Development - Roanoke River Greenway – East	56.6	\$225,000
Parks & Recreation - Stonebridge Park	56.3	\$250,000
Parks & Recreation - Whispering Pines	56.2	\$320,000

Fire Rescue - Hanging Rock New Station	55.9	\$2,000,000
Parks & Recreation - Starkey Park	55.8	\$1,386,000
Fire Rescue - Station Renovations	55.3	\$597,000
Information Technology - Server Replacement	55.1	\$772,500
Parks & Recreation - Green Hill Park Phase III	55.0	\$1,410,000
Parks & Recreation - Walrond Park Phase III	54.7	\$489,000
General Services - Recycling Trailers	54.2	\$100,000
Parks & Recreation - Goode Park	54.2	\$122,000
Information Technology - Disaster Recovery Hot Site	54.1	\$150,000
Library - Circulation Self-Checkout System	54.0	\$146,000
Information Technology - Enterprise Network Security	54.0	\$175,000
Greenway Development - Mudlick Creek Greenway	53.8	\$608,250
Parks & Recreation - Camp Roanoke	53.6	\$203,500
General Services - Renovations to Service Center	53.3	\$1,200,000

**Level 4:**

Parks & Recreation - Hollins Park	52.1	\$285,000
Information Technology - Computer Network Infrastructure Upgrade	51.9	\$657,500
Parks & Recreation - Vinyard Park Phase III	50.7	\$532,000
Community Development - GIS - New Server	49.0	\$50,000
Fire Rescue - Station Fuel Control System	48.9	\$120,000
Parks & Recreation - Northside High Tennis Court Restoration	48.8	\$180,000
Police - Bomb Disposal Unit	48.7	\$125,605
Information Technology - Voice Over IP	48.4	\$300,000
Parks & Recreation - Family Water Park	47.9	\$4,725,000
Police - In Service Training Facility	47.7	\$147,024
Parks & Recreation - Spring Hollow Park	46.2	\$2,005,000
Community Development - GIS - New Color Scanner/Printer	46.0	\$50,000
Information Technology - Lawson HR/Payroll Enhancement	44.3	\$200,000

# Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

## Project Score Summary - By Category

<b>Department - Project</b>	<b>Average Total Score</b>	<b>Total Capital Cost</b>
<b><u>Category A: Public Safety</u></b>		
Sheriff - Regional Jail Project	89.0	\$20,000,000
Public Safety - 800 MHz Radio System Upgrade	75.4	\$14,000,000
Fire Rescue - New City/County Co-Staffed Station	62.4	\$900,000
Police - South County Police Precinct	57.8	\$265,000
Fire Rescue - New Oak Grove Station	57.8	\$2,000,000
Fire Rescue - Back Creek Station Addition	57.1	\$330,000
Fire Rescue - Hanging Rock New Station	55.9	\$2,000,000
Fire Rescue - Station Renovations	55.3	\$597,000
Police - Bomb Disposal Unit	48.7	\$125,605
Police - In Service Training Facility	47.7	\$147,024
<b><u>Category B: Technology</u></b>		
Fire Rescue - EMS Data Reporting System	72.3	\$145,000
Information Technology - Replacement of HP/3000	68.3	\$1,000,000
Community Development - GIS Phase II - Integration	60.4	\$100,000
Information Technology - Server Replacement	55.1	\$772,500
Information Technology - Disaster Recovery Hot Site	54.1	\$150,000
Information Technology - Enterprise Network Security	54.0	\$175,000
General Services - Renovations to Service Center	53.3	\$1,200,000
Information Technology - Computer Network Infrastructure Upgrade	51.9	\$657,500
Community Development - GIS - New Server	49.0	\$50,000
Fire Rescue - Station Fuel Control System	48.9	\$120,000
Information Technology - Voice Over IP	48.4	\$300,000
Community Development - GIS - New Color Scanner/Printer	46.0	\$50,000
Information Technology - Lawson HR/Payroll Enhancement	44.3	\$200,000
<b><u>Category C: Quality of Life</u></b>		
Library - South County Library	71.1	\$13,078,000
Parks & Recreation - Garst Mill Park Improvements	69.8	\$230,000
Library - Glenvar Library Expansion	63.3	\$2,130,000
Parks & Recreation - Brambleton Center	61.4	\$375,500
Library - Mt. Pleasant Library Relocation	61.0	\$801,750
Parks & Recreation - Brookside Park	60.0	\$217,000
Library - Vinton Library Renovation	58.8	\$857,000



# Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

## Project Score Summary - By Category

<b>Department - Project</b>	<b>Average Total Score</b>	<b>Total Capital Cost</b>
Parks & Recreation - Burton Softball Complex	58.7	\$355,000
Library - Bent Mountain Library Expansion	56.9	\$128,500
Greenway Development - Roanoke River Greenway - East	56.6	\$225,000
Parks & Recreation - Stonebridge Park	56.3	\$250,000
Parks & Recreation - Whispering Pines	56.2	\$320,000
Parks & Recreation - Starkey Park	55.8	\$1,386,000
Parks & Recreation - Green Hill Park Phase III	55.0	\$1,410,000
Parks & Recreation - Walrond Park Phase III	54.7	\$489,000
General Services - Recycling Trailers	54.2	\$100,000
Parks & Recreation - Goode Park	54.2	\$122,000
Library - Circulation Self-Checkout System	54.0	\$146,000
Greenway Development - Mudlick Creek Greenway	53.8	\$608,250
Parks & Recreation - Camp Roanoke	53.6	\$203,500
Parks & Recreation - Hollins Park	52.1	\$285,000
Parks & Recreation - Vinyard Park Phase III	50.7	\$532,000
Parks & Recreation - Northside High Tennis Court Restoration	48.8	\$180,000
Parks & Recreation - Family Water Park	47.9	\$4,725,000
Parks & Recreation - Spring Hollow Park	46.2	\$2,005,000
<b><u>Category D: Service Infrastructure</u></b>		
General Services - New Garage at Kessler Mill Road	77.1	\$1,180,000
Community Development - VDOT Revenue Sharing	73.8	\$2,500,000
Parks & Recreation - Parks & Recreation Land Bank	64.3	\$975,000
Economic Development - Center for Research Technology	62.3	\$5,750,000
Community Development - Regional Storm Water Mgt/Flood Control	61.3	\$7,500,000

# Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

## Recommendations

Long-term capital planning and the need to fund critical capital assets is one of the most important functions undertaken by local government. It is also one of the most challenging. In order to implement an effective capital plan, the CIP Review Committee recommends several options that should be considered by the Board of Supervisors and staff:

### **Capital Project Financing**

#### Dedicated Funding

The Committee is very encouraged with the work done to-date in developing funding alternatives for the County's capital requirements (policies adopted by the School Board on 12/09/04 and by the Board of Supervisors on 12/22/04); however, given the magnitude of current and projected capital needs over the next 5 years it is essential that the existing funding stream be increased. While existing expenditure savings have been re-allocated to capital projects over the past several years, a significant portion of revenue growth (or new revenue sources) should also be allocated to adequately fund the capital program. Given current economic conditions, this opportunity may not present itself again for some time.

Concern exists among Committee members that a combined County/School funding proposal (reviewed during the Committee's capital project analysis) recommending a cycle of 2 years funding of School projects followed by 1 year funding of County projects may not address the most pressing capital needs of the (entire) County at that specific period in time. The Committee recommends establishing project funding selection criteria that is both equitable and flexible. Re-evaluation of projects based on current need should be conducted on a year-by-year basis and funded accordingly.

#### Debt Financing

While borrowing increases the overall cost of a capital project, long-term debt is a viable alternative in order to satisfy important capital needs by spreading the cost over a longer period of time.

*Considering the extensive capital needs observed throughout the county, the Committee believes serious consideration should be given to the possibility of a General Obligation Bond issue sometime in the near future, coupled with the appropriate master planning. The last GO Bond Issue in Roanoke County was 1992 and totaled approximately \$10 million.*

### **Capital Maintenance**

As the Committee noted during last year's review certain projects, at first glance, did not look to be suitable for inclusion in a capital program. These projects had the character of on-going repair and maintenance requests that should be provided for in operational budgets. With service levels expanding over time and operating budgets remaining relatively constant, capital maintenance has been deferred until the operational need became a capital need. The areas exhibiting the most need were library facilities and fire and rescue stations.

The addition of supplementary capital maintenance funds in the FY04-05 County budget was a significant stride in protecting the County's investments in facilities. **The Committee strongly recommends additional allocations for capital maintenance funds** to address facility upgrades and repairs to alleviate safety concerns and protect current capital investments.

### **Long Range Capital Planning**

The CIP is an important component of a locality's overall planning process and should be developed in conjunction with the comprehensive plan, annual budget process, strategic plan and other long-range planning initiatives. By definition, the CIP is a multi-year plan used to identify (and prioritize) capital projects to be funded during the planning period. Currently, the County's capital project needs are accumulated, prioritized, and funding is identified for a small number of projects—primarily only in the current budget development year (Year 1 of the 5 year planning period of the CIP).

To be an effective planning and financial management tool, the Committee recommends identifying potential funding streams for all projects that are presented as part of the 5 year plan; thus, establishing a fully-funded CIP rather than a wish list of projects that may or may not be funded. While projects and financing sources listed in the CIP for years other than Year 1 are not authorized until the annual budget for those years is legally adopted, Years 2-5 serve as a guide for future planning and are subject to further review and modification in subsequent years as the environment at that time dictates.

### **Land Banking**

Given the scarcity of available undeveloped land in Roanoke County, long-range planning methods should be employed (in conjunction with the Community Plan) to identify opportunities to purchase land where future public facilities can be located. Population shifts and demographic changes will cause alterations in the level and types of services our citizens will demand in the future and the County must be in a position to deliver these services.

Land suitable for schools, parks, and other purposes (i.e. watershed protection) is being developed for other uses. The cost of land is also increasing quickly. Consequently, sites on which to build schools, conserve open space for recreation, and protect the watershed will become increasingly difficult to identify and increasingly costly to acquire. Land banking can be a responsible, cost-effective way to ensure that the public agencies acquire future sites under the most desirable terms, without operating under a burden of tight time frames. The concept of a land banking fund is to acquire land as soon as possible while the land is still available and relatively affordable even though it may not be needed for several years. With the use of land banking funds, the individual departments and their respective advisory or elected bodies would still be responsible for developing master plans, identifying potential sites that meet the master plan criteria, approving actual sites for acquisition, acquiring and managing the land, and eventually constructing and managing the facilities.

While investments in real estate for future use produces few "short-term" benefits for public consumption, the possibility of realizing a current return on investment does exist. While land inventories are waiting for development of public infrastructure, alternative uses should be sought to generate income (leasing, fee-based recreational activities, etc.). This concept supports one of

the Committee's adopted Guiding Principles—to anticipate future facility and infrastructure needs to best leverage capital resources of the community.

### **Departmental Master Planning**

Roanoke County has undergone significant demographic and service demand changes, and these changes are anticipated to continue into the future. These changes will have a direct effect on how and where services are provided to our citizens. In order to accurately anticipate the nature and extent of future capital needs, the Committee suggests (as it did last year) developing, or updating, master plans for some departments. Fire & Rescue, Libraries, and Parks & Recreation are departments that could greatly benefit from this undertaking.

## Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

### Footnotes on Specific Capital Projects

#### **New Public Safety Center**

The new Public Safety Center was removed from the prioritization list due to the Board of Supervisor's appropriation of funds for the project.

#### **Note from the facilitator (Budget Director)**

For a project to be considered "approved" and thus removed from the Committee's scoring consideration, an appropriation of funds for that project must be made.

# Appendix

# Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

## Goal & Objectives

### Committee Goal

The CIP Review Committee is a collaborative group established to evaluate and prioritize identified capital projects from a community perspective based upon countywide priorities articulated by the Board of Supervisors.

### Committee Objectives

1. To be acquainted with the history of the County of Roanoke's Capital Improvement Program and the proposed process for the development of the CIP.
2. To become familiar with countywide capital needs identified by department heads through the review of proposals, participation in site visits, and interviews as needed.
3. To evaluate submitted capital projects based on criteria that support the County's mission and guiding principals.
4. To make recommendations on capital priorities for the Board of Supervisor's consideration by January 2005.

# Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

## Project Evaluation Criteria

Providing effective and efficient services and improving the quality of life of its citizens is the County of Roanoke's mission and the foundation of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The Capital Improvement Review Committee has identified the following *Guiding Principles* for evaluating and prioritizing capital project requests in making recommendations to the Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. These principles are based on the stated priorities and approved plans of the Board of Supervisors. These principles are presented in no particular order of importance, as individual perspective will influence the relative value of each principle when compared to one another. *The Guiding Principles are as follows:*

- Provide effective and efficient governmental services to the citizens.
- Enhance public health, safety, and/or welfare issue(s).
- Promote the safety and security of our citizens while at home, at work, and at play.
- Consider solutions that extend beyond the County's boundaries in meeting future challenges.
- Use public investment as a catalyst for economic growth in a manner consistent with the Community Plan.
- Safeguard the environment and natural beauty for present and future generations.
- Maintain and sustain effective land use planning.
- Maintain or enhance cultural, recreational, educational, and social opportunities for all citizens.
- Protect existing investment in facilities and infrastructure that are vital in delivering fundamental services to our citizens.
- Anticipate future facility and infrastructure needs to best leverage capital resources of the community.
- Comply with applicable state and federal mandates.



# Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

## Evaluation Scoring Factors

Committee members scored each capital project using a point range of 1-10 for each of the following factors:

### ***Improve Public Safety or Public Health:***

Does the project address public safety, life protection, health, and welfare issues that benefit our citizens? Does the project mitigate an existing or potential liability issue?

### ***Improve Public Quality of Life:***

Does the project directly address a major demand or meet a community obligation for cultural, social, educational or leisure services?

### ***Legal Requirements:***

Is the project required by law, regulation or mandate from local, state, or federal government?

### ***Economic Development Impact:***

Does the project directly or indirectly increase net community wealth/resources?

### ***Increases Tax or Fee Revenue:***

Does the project directly increase County's recurring revenues?

### ***Enhances Existing Services:***

Does the project maintain or enhance existing service levels that are at risk without the project?

### ***Benefit/Cost Factor:***

Does project implementation produce a community benefit that exceeds investment of resources or will the project generate resources/investments from outside sources (grants, donations, etc.)?

### ***Address Obsolescence:***

Does the project address requirements for asset replacement, due to age and wear, that supports essential services or addresses the need for a new or changing service demand?

### ***Investment to Reduce Future Costs:***

Will investment in the project reduce/contain increased expenditures at a future date?

### ***Extent of Service Area:***

Does the project benefit a large population (i.e. a project that benefits a larger population/area will have greater value than a project that benefits a smaller population/area)?

### ***Project Supports Existing County Plans or Policies:***

Is the project directly referenced in existing county plans or policies as a priority?

### ***Urgency of Need:***

Does the project meet an urgent need?

## Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

### General Committee Comments

In the process of evaluating proposals and subsequent discussions, the members of the CIP Review Committee commented on several ways to enhance the capital programming process. The following comments are not necessarily the consensus of the entire committee, but are important to be noted:

- As the CIP continues to evolve as a meaningful planning tool for the County, it is important to constantly evaluate the components of the CIP to insure the right balance of information is utilized to facilitate effective decision making. For example, the current cost for a project to be included in the CIP is \$50,000. There was discussion on the merits of raising this floor amount to \$100,000-\$300,000 to focus more on true capital items and away from maintenance and renovation needs (assuming capital maintenance is addressed).
- The Board's approval of the policies for Major Capital and Minor Capital funding sources was a positive step in capital planning. It may be desirable to also look at grouping CIP projects in a similar fashion when evaluating and prioritizing capital needs.
- When undertaking capital planning a broader, more qualitative, view must always be considered. What are these projects going to do to enhance the community (impact on neighborhoods and region)? Does this leverage future investments? What is the residual effect? Does it affect future economic, quality of life, or public safety considerations? There needs to be a broad, strategic vision for the community that guides decision making.

# Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

## Committee Member Comments by Department/Project

### ***Community Development - GIS - New Color Scanner/Printer***

Average Total Score: 46.0, Level 4

- The product of this printer can be provided by an outside service... the county can sell prints to those that need to order them, but the supplies for these plotters are expensive and I don't think the county is in the print making business.

### ***Community Development - GIS Phase II - Integration***

Average Total Score: 60.0, Level 2

- Seems extremely beneficial to public safety.
- Funding for this project should be shared by the Water Authority and the County School System.
- This project is not initially eye-catching, but when one considers that this technology upgrade positively impacts multiple safety and service concerns within the county, it becomes clear that it provides great bang for the buck.

### ***Community Development - Regional Storm Water Mgt/Flood Control***

Average Total Score: 61.0, Level 2

- The monies allocated for this project over the next five years total \$7,500,000. A portion of these funds will be used to apply for grants that could possibly greatly exceed the initial investment. The project is worthwhile and the funding mechanism provides solid bang for the buck.

### ***Community Development - VDOT Revenue Sharing***

Average Total Score: 74.0, Level 1

- Much road work is required in the County.
- I consider the condition of community roadways to be a major indicator of the commitment that community has toward quality of life. Investing \$500,000 annually that may be matched by VDOT shows great commitment.

### ***Economic Development - Center for Research Technology***

Average Total Score: 62.0, Level 2

- I'm excited to see money being spent to attract good jobs/businesses to our area.
- The consideration of the CRT as site for the Regional Jail suggests that funding of the CRT be re-evaluated. If this development is considered for uses other than what it was originally designed for, the funding should be reduced until such time that the County decides how it wants to use the CRT.
- The CRT must maintain physical and financial readiness to act swiftly when opportunities arise to attract new businesses. Its location close to I-81 and a major research university bode well for the future. Continued investment is needed to help the CRT maintain viability.
- The CRT is an important component for the growth and sustainability for Roanoke County and surrounding communities.
- The continuing development of CRT is important to the future of the county's growth and stability.

### ***Fire Rescue - Back Creek Station Addition***

Average Total Score: 57.0, Level 3

- There is an incredible need for space at this station.
- Would reduce load on Cave Spring Station.

### ***Fire Rescue - EMS Data Reporting System***

Average Total Score: 72.0, Level 1

- It's a no brainer....spend \$145,000 this year, continue to get \$300,000 each year. Don't spend the 145K, then you lose \$300k/year.
- Why not purchase a few devices as a test project to see how they perform before an all-out investment.

- Will save County money - has a short payback time.
- If the potential gain from this project is indeed \$300,000 annually, a one time investment of \$145,000 seems prudent.
- Completion of this project should produce revenue for EMS services. Consider designating all receipts above a floor amount to fire station improvements.
- Since this project collects more money than it costs, it should be a no brainer.
- Medicare guidelines are very strict in accordance to reimbursement for ambulance transport of senior citizens. According to the billing company about 70% is denied from Medicare due to the fact other modes of transportation are available. Before proceeding the benefit and cost of outsourcing should be investigated.

#### ***Fire Rescue - Hanging Rock New Station***

Average Total Score: 56.0, Level 3

- Area in most need.
- Instead of a new station at Hanging Rock, expansion of the station at Mason's Cove should be explored.
- This project, if not funded, will become an urgent need project before much longer.

#### ***Fire Rescue - New City/County Co-Staffed Station***

Average Total Score: 62.0, Level 2

- With Hollins fire dept responding to more calls than any other station it makes sense to partner with the city to provide better protection to this area. It's cost effective, both to partner with the city and to leave the Hollins staff in their area so they are able to respond to calls in a more timely manner.
- First priority would put this project as part of a land bank purchase. More research seems necessary on this station proposal.
- Would be nice to have - present system is working.
- Cooperative ventures with neighboring municipalities should be pursued whenever possible.
- Partnering with Roanoke City reduces the cost of a new station.
- Roanoke County needs to be ready to move on this project whenever the city is ready.
- While I don't believe that this project is urgent now, it will be later when it costs a lot more.

#### ***Fire Rescue - New Oak Grove Station***

Average Total Score: 58.0, Level 3

- By the year 2007 the Oak Grove station would be serving hundreds of new homes in that area. Project would be extremely beneficial to those new homeowners.
- Would reduce response time - but not in line with the cost.
- Is a joint project with Roanoke City a possibility in this area?
- This project, if not funded, will become an urgent need project before much longer.
- Consider a county/city station.
- It should be explored as to whether this station could be a joint city/county station due to the close proximity to the city.

#### ***Fire Rescue - Station Fuel Control System***

Average Total Score: 49.0, Level 4

- Good project if more money was available.
- Abuse of current procedures are non-existent.

#### ***Fire Rescue - Station Renovations***

Average Total Score: 55.0, Level 3

- No doubt these things need to be done. It would seem that, at some point, the county would begin looking at spending money to maintain their buildings. Firemen, volunteers, and workers should not be asked to live in some of the conditions we saw.
- Must maintain what we have.
- Would like to have seen a break down of each station's renovation needs and their priority given by EMS Chief. Many of the renovations are actually maintenance items.

- This project consists of a multitude of smaller maintenance items at fire stations around the county. Some would not likely qualify as a capital improvement project were they not combined.
- These projects should be completed as maintenance issues from a continuing maintenance fund. Without the maintenance fund, they must be completed as CIP projects whose scores don't reflect the need.

#### ***General Services - New Garage at Kessler Mill Road***

Average Total Score: 77.0, Level 1

- It would be impossible to not see the need for this project.
- I believe in a new garage versus farming out our vehicle problems.
- Every department in County depends on this garage - should be large enough to service the 600 vehicles the County owns.
- The existing garage appears to violate OSHA regulations for workplace safety. It frankly amazes me that county vehicles are serviced as well as they are given the significant garage limitations. A new garage consisting of 14 bays would provide the capacity to service fire and solid waste vehicles that now are outsourced. It is estimated that this might save \$100,000 to \$200,000 per year. The county depends heavily on vehicles to administer county business efficiently and safely. In my opinion, a new garage should be one of the top three projects considered.

#### ***General Services - Recycling Trailers***

Average Total Score: 54.0, Level 3

- A public/private partnership might advance this project.
- Recycling enhances the environment, a benefit to all county residents. A cleaner community also makes it more attractive to outside interests. All in all, investment in this project makes good ecological sense.

#### ***General Services - Renovations to Service Center***

Average Total Score: 53.0, Level 3

- Again, this seems like a more of a maintenance project but these things need to be done.
- Some monies need to be implemented to bring codes up to date!
- Project should be combined with new County garage.
- There is little doubt that the Service Center on Kessler Mill is in disrepair. I fear that investing funds on building repairs will be a very temporary fix. It is an old building not designed for its current purpose. I support the razing of the current facility and construction of a new, smaller, more efficient facility on the hill behind the current location.
- The possibility of building a new center vs renovating the current center should be examined and evaluated.

#### ***Greenway Development - Mudlick Creek Greenway***

Average Total Score: 54.0, Level 3

- There seems to be a desire to fast track this project in order to "piggyback" onto a VDOT roadway project. Adjoining landowners to this project have not been notified nor involved in this project. Public involvement must be included. There is also a potential for misuse of this greenway due to a portion of it being remote, in regards to visibility from roadways.
- This greenway project carries a higher price tag and involves several engineering challenges. There is currently less grant money dedicated to the project. These factors make this greenway project slightly less attractive than the Roanoke River Greenway.

#### ***Greenway Development - Roanoke River Greenway - East***

Average Total Score: 57.0, Level 3

- Unfortunately, Greenways do not score well within the current rating scheme. However, there is little doubt that a comprehensive system of greenways in the Roanoke Valley would make our community a highly desirable place to live and work. Continued investment in this process is vital.

#### ***Information Technology - Disaster Recovery Hot Site***

Average Total Score: 54.0, Level 3

- I don't think this is the right approach for this issue.

### ***Information Technology - Replacement of HP/3000***

Average Total Score: 68.0, Level 1

- Do we really have a choice?
- Must stay current.
- This project supports systems purchased in fiscal year 2004/2005.

### ***Information Technology - Voice Over IP***

Average Total Score: 48.0, Level 4

- Voice Over LAN using IP will benefit the county residents. I'm not sure that VoIP will have as much a benefit because the service is still in the hands of companies that may be short lived.

### ***Library - Bent Mountain Library Expansion***

Average Total Score: 57.0, Level 3

- Scoring does not accurately reflect the benefit to this community. Due to it's location in the County, Bent Mountain residents receive a disproportionately lesser amount of County services than other communities. Funding for this project should be given weighted consideration.

### ***Library - Circulation Self-Checkout System***

Average Total Score: 54.0, Level 3

- Will reduce the number of personnel needed.
- Although the savings in staff hours would be beneficial, and would allow for re-assignment of staff to other branches that have staffing shortages, the core needs of the library must first be addressed and met prior to advancing this project.
- The operating costs that average \$15,000 per year seem a bit high. However, freeing up employees to help visitors somewhat offsets these costs.

### ***Library - Glenvar Library Expansion***

Average Total Score: 63.0, Level 2

- The scoring of this project does not accurately reflect the need. One key issue is that the current facility is not ADA compliant. Additionally, residents in this section of the County are not in close proximity to a number of other County services. We must work toward establishing some parity in the services we provide to each area of the County. Instead of fees for usage of conference rooms, perhaps we could encourage civic groups and businesses to contribute to this project and dedicate these rooms to that group (or their designee).

### ***Library - Mt. Pleasant Library Relocation***

Average Total Score: 61.0, Level 2

- If the project gets funded please don't put yourself in a position where you need more space in a couple of years.
- Several issues are involved in this project. Non-compliance with state standards is a severe understatement. The current facility does not meet the needs of residents in regards to availability of materials and hours of operation. Residents in this area of the County are not in close proximity to other County services, therefore the project is also an issue of equitable distribution of taxpayer services. A new library would enhance the resources available to our school children and serve as a focus of the community. Meeting rooms would also provide an opportunity to serve as a satellite location for adult continuing education classes. Corporate sponsorship is not a consideration, as this area of the County has been primarily used for residential development. Site selection is an issue. Recommend that considered sites be north of Back Creek / Rt 116 Bridge. Any locations south of this point would require citizens to traverse Windy Gap Mountain. This would also be a concern in a joint venture with Franklin County, as it's residents would be subjected to the same dangers when traveling. This project should remain a high priority.

### ***Library - South County Library***

Average Total Score: 71.0, Level 1

- It seemed that all the libraries we looked at were in need of space.
- A library that is so heavily used by county and city residents yet undersized and understaffed needs to be replaced. Is a strong force for relocating businesses and families. This facility must have top priority in landbank purchasing.

- One of the most used facilities in County - must be enlarged to meet County needs.
- South County Library is currently the main distribution center for our library system. This distribution activity could be transferred to another branch that might have somewhat better accessibility and a little more space. Parking space is limited and might deter some from using the library. Expansion is needed, not only for books, but to comply with fire code for occupancy numbers.
- The need for a library headquarters is obvious. The sooner this project gets off the ground, the more money will be saved on engineering and construction costs.
- Consider leasing available retail property. Could combine with South County Police Precinct and/or Oak Grove Fire Station.

#### ***Library - Vinton Library Renovation***

Average Total Score: 59.0, Level 3

- Handicap accessibility remains a problem at this library as does several safety hazards (both for staff and patrons). ADA issues could be a potential liability. A joint venture with Vinton might be the only way to advance this project and should be discussed.

#### ***Parks & Recreation - Brambleton Center***

Average Total Score: 61.0, Level 2

- Again, the county needs to address maintenance/upkeep issues that seem to be popping up with many different projects.
- Used by large number of County citizens - must be kept in good repair.

#### ***Parks & Recreation - Brookside Park***

Average Total Score: 60.0, Level 2

- I believe that this park should be placed in a high priority status as there is no handicap access. There is no way for someone who is in a wheel chair to access the park and there is no way for our mowers to access the park unless they go through a creek or up stairs.
- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.

#### ***Parks & Recreation - Burton Softball Complex***

Average Total Score: 59.0, Level 3

- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.

#### ***Parks & Recreation - Camp Roanoke***

Average Total Score: 54.0, Level 3

- The possibility of this park being used as a tourist facility is not consistent with protection of municipal water supplies. Will the Water Authority place restrictions on Spring Hollow to follow guidelines set by the Office of Homeland Security?
- The camp produces income for the county that goes against the expenditure. It is a great experience for the children of Roanoke county and provides employment of county teens during the summer.

#### ***Parks & Recreation - Family Water Park***

Average Total Score: 48.0, Level 4

- Seems like a great idea for Roanoke!
- Why not have a park that charges a fee and brings more revenue into the community.
- Nice - but not necessary.
- If it was a destination attraction, it could add to tourism in the area, as well as pay for itself.

#### ***Parks & Recreation - Garst Mill Park Improvements***

Average Total Score: 70.0, Level 1

- This needs to be addressed as soon as possible.
- The erosion problem needs immediate attention before investment in "park" type programs.
- In order to effectively correct problems and meet park needs, the stream bank erosion should be a separate CIP project. However, when combined with other park maintenance needs, this project scored lower than I anticipated.
- Creek bank erosion at Garst Mill Park is jeopardizing the busiest park in the county and it gets worse with

every heavy rain. Repairs need to start while there is something to repair.

***Parks & Recreation - Goode Park***

Average Total Score: 54.0, Level 3

- I like the fact that we're improving a Greenway and a park all at the same time.
- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.

***Parks & Recreation - Green Hill Park Phase III***

Average Total Score: 55.0, Level 3

- Amphitheater should be a separate CIP project.
- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.

***Parks & Recreation - Hollins Park***

Average Total Score: 52.0, Level 4

- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.

***Parks & Recreation - Northside High Tennis Court Restoration***

Average Total Score: 49.0, Level 4

- Partnership with Roanoke County Schools is preferable.
- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.

***Parks & Recreation - Parks & Recreation Land Bank***

Average Total Score: 64.0, Level 2

- Extremely happy that the board and the departments are addressing land banking.
- There should be more land banking done for all facets of county needs!
- The county needs to look at land banking for many areas, not just Parks and Recreation. It would be beneficial to libraries, schools, fire and rescue, and police.
- Land banking should be a top priority before it's too late.

***Parks & Recreation - Spring Hollow Park***

Average Total Score: 46.0, Level 4

- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.
- Should we open up our water supply with unlimited access to the public?

***Parks & Recreation - Starkey Park***

Average Total Score: 56.0, Level 3

- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.

***Parks & Recreation - Stonebridge Park***

Average Total Score: 56.0, Level 3

- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.

***Parks & Recreation - Vinyard Park Phase III***

Average Total Score: 51.0, Level 4

- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.
- Does the handicap trout fishing area increase County liability? Are we coordinating with the Virginia Dept of Game and Fisheries? Greenway project should be a separate CIP request.

***Parks & Recreation - Walrond Park Phase III***

Average Total Score: 55.0, Level 3

- Baseball under poor lighting seems to put the county at risk of a liability suit.
- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.

***Parks & Recreation - Whispering Pines***

Average Total Score: 56.0, Level 3

- There should be an annual maintenance fund for these kinds of projects.



### ***Police - Bomb Disposal Unit***

Average Total Score: 49.0, Level 4

- If we must, we must.
- State police have a unit in Salem.
- Cost benefit ratio needs to be studied for cost to have someone else deal with the problem and the wait time for the response to a bomb threat
- Joint venture with neighboring municipalities might be the only way to see this project advance.

### ***Police - In Service Training Facility***

Average Total Score: 48.0, Level 4

- If we as citizens look for good protection of our property and ourselves, law enforcement officers should be trained to the top degree.
- Poor planning - should have been included in the Public Safety Building.
- There are training facilities available - Cardinal Criminal Justice Academy - in the valley that Roanoke County can utilize for staff and community training. In addition, the proposed site of this building is remote and would not likely attract citizens to community programs. An alternate solution would be to add some space to the proposed South County Precinct to provide for fitness/training facilities for police officers. Community programs would also be more visible and easily accessible in the South County area.
- A lot of volunteer work goes into this project.
- The need for this project was created by the exclusion of a gymnasium at the new Public Safety Center.
- While the need for this project is evident, there is some doubt as to this project's urgency. The district supervisor for this area is on record complaining about the police shooting range. Expansion of this facility does not seem to reflect the opinions of West County residents and their supervisor. Would like to see further study of this project.

### ***Police - South County Police Precinct***

Average Total Score: 58.0, Level 3

- Perhaps the Precinct building could be constructed along with an existing building. Save money.
- Not needed with new Public Safety Building.
- A South County precinct would decrease response times to that area, but more importantly, Roanoke County Police would increase their community presence, a benefit that cannot be measured in dollars.
- Should include a new police precinct as a part of other South County needs, i.e., Oak Grove Fire Station and 419 Library. Properties like the old Brendle's store at Tanglewood and the soon old Kroger's store at Cave Spring Corners could serve as a library and police precinct. Selling of the current 419 Library would fund many library improvements plus pay the lease at a new location for some time.
- This project should have been addressed in the planning of the PSA project.
- Having a station in south county would greatly benefit the citizens and the police.
- Emphasis on a South County Precinct has been cited as a need to have public access to police information. However, we currently have an information office located in Tanglewood Mall. Police officers use laptops which helps maximize personnel resources. Wouldn't response times increase with additional officers on patrol? Police interaction needs for school age children are met through School Resource Officers. The Roanoke County Crime Prevention Office continues to generate criticism by neighborhood watch groups over the past year, a new precinct will not address this problem. Completion of the new Public Service Center in North County should be able to provide criminal investigation personnel with needed space for interviews, allow them to have ready access to resources, and have other officers on property should a need arise.

### ***Public Safety - 800 MHz Radio System Upgrade***

Average Total Score: 75.0, Level 1

- Because this project enhances the ability of public safety personnel in Roanoke City and Roanoke County to communicate with one another, it should remain a top priority until completed.
- Waiting on Roanoke City... not yet a priority.

### ***Sheriff - Regional Jail Project***

Average Total Score: 89.0, Level 1

- Take advantage of the \$ the state has to reduce the cost to Roanoke County tax payers. Has there been any consideration in using the current jail and court as juvenile detention and juvenile court?
- I support the building of a County regional jail as an utmost priority. Fewer men in a cell produces less agitation; perhaps better rehabilitation. There is too much fear generated by some of the public on it's location. It will probably be a visual and safety addition to the community.
- All options should be explored - joining with other regional jails, etc.
- Construction of a regional jail benefits Roanoke County, Salem, Montgomery County, and Franklin County. It will enhance public safety in all four jurisdictions by providing sufficient bed space to house dangerous offenders. It will also provide a possible source of income through housing prisoners from other agencies for a daily fee. Up to 50% of the cost of construction may come from the Commonwealth. Delaying construction until the next jail funding cycle could yield substantially higher construction costs.
- Roanoke County should find as many partners as possible to share the overhead expenses of this project. There is no advantage to a Roanoke County only project. This project should proceed as soon as possible due to the extended time for planning, design and construction. Best case would put start up in three to four years. The need is now and will continue to increase.
- Even though this project is being addressed, the process is just beginning and it should have been solved a long time ago.
- Roanoke County must expedite this project. This request has been known for some years and prior Boards have failed to address the problem. Delaying the jail for 2 years will only cost taxpayers millions of dollars. A regional concept to help reduce the burden to Roanoke County is a sound approach and should not be abandoned.

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee  
Project Score Summary - Category Breakdown

Project	Category A: Public Safety	Category B: Technology	Category C: Quality of Life	Category D: Service Infrastructure
Sheriff - Regional Jail Project	89.0			
General Services - New Garage at Kessler Mill Road				77.1
Public Safety - 800 MHz Radio System Upgrade	75.4			
Community Development - VDOT Revenue Sharing				73.8
Fire Rescue - EMS Data Reporting System		72.3		
Library - South County Library			71.1	
Parks & Recreation - Garst Mill Park Improvements			69.8	
Information Technology - Replacement of HP/3000		68.3		
Parks & Recreation - Parks & Recreation Land Bank				64.3
Library - Glenvar Library Expansion			63.3	
Fire Rescue - New City/County Co-Staffed Station	62.4			
Economic Development - Center for Research Technology				62.3
Parks & Recreation - Brambleton Center			61.4	
Community Development - Regional Storm Water Mgt/Flood Control				61.3
Library - Mt. Pleasant Library Relocation			61.0	
Community Development - GIS Phase II - Integration		60.4		
Parks & Recreation - Brookside Park			60.0	
Library - Vinton Library Renovation			58.8	
Parks & Recreation - Burton Softball Complex			58.7	
Police - South County Police Precinct	57.8			
Fire Rescue - New Oak Grove Station	57.8			
Fire Rescue - Back Creek Station Addition	57.1			
Library - Bent Mountain Library Expansion			56.9	
Greenway Development - Roanoke River Greenway - East			56.6	
Parks & Recreation - Stonebridge Park			56.3	
Parks & Recreation - Whispering Pines			56.2	
Fire Rescue - Hanging Rock New Station	55.9			
Parks & Recreation - Starkey Park			55.8	
Fire Rescue - Station Renovations	55.3			
Information Technology - Server Replacement		55.1		
Parks & Recreation - Green Hill Park Phase III			55.0	
Parks & Recreation - Walrond Park Phase III			54.7	
General Services - Recycling Trailers			54.2	
Parks & Recreation - Goode Park			54.2	
Information Technology - Disaster Recovery Hot Site		54.1		
Information Technology - Enterprise Network Security		54.0		
Library - Circulation Self-Checkout System			54.0	
Greenway Development - Mudlick Creek Greenway			53.8	
Parks & Recreation - Camp Roanoke			53.6	
General Services - Renovations to Service Center		53.3		
Parks & Recreation - Hollins Park			52.1	
Information Technology - Computer Network Infrastructure Upgrade		51.9		
Parks & Recreation - Vinyard Park Phase III			50.7	
Community Development - GIS - New Server		49.0		
Fire Rescue - Station Fuel Control System		48.9		
Parks & Recreation - Northside High Tennis Court Restoration			48.8	
Police - Bomb Disposal Unit	48.7			
Information Technology - Voice Over IP		48.4		
Parks & Recreation - Family Water Park			47.9	
Police - In Service Training Facility	47.7			
Parks & Recreation - Spring Hollow Park			46.2	
Community Development - GIS - New Color Scanner/Printer		46.0		
Information Technology - Lawson HR/Payroll Enhancement		44.3		

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee  
Project Score Summary - Cost Breakdown

Project	Less than \$300,000	\$300,000 - \$1,000,000	\$1,000,000 - \$20,000,000
Sheriff - Regional Jail Project			89.0
General Services - New Garage at Kessler Mill Road			77.1
Public Safety - 800 MHz Radio System Upgrade			75.4
Community Development - VDOT Revenue Sharing			73.8
Fire Rescue - EMS Data Reporting System	72.3		
Library - South County Library			71.1
Parks & Recreation - Garst Mill Park Improvements	69.8		
Information Technology - Replacement of HP/3000		68.3	
Parks & Recreation - Parks & Recreation Land Bank		64.3	
Library - Glenvar Library Expansion			63.3
Fire Rescue - New City/County Co-Staffed Station		62.4	
Economic Development - Center for Research Technology			62.3
Parks & Recreation - Brambleton Center		61.4	
Community Development - Regional Storm Water Mgt/Flood Control			61.3
Library - Mt. Pleasant Library Relocation		61.0	
Community Development - GIS Phase II - Integration	60.4		
Parks & Recreation - Brookside Park	60.0		
Library - Vinton Library Renovation		58.8	
Parks & Recreation - Burton Softball Complex		58.7	
Police - South County Police Precinct	57.8		
Fire Rescue - New Oak Grove Station			57.8
Fire Rescue - Back Creek Station Addition		57.1	
Library - Bent Mountain Library Expansion	56.9		
Greenway Development - Roanoke River Greenway - East	56.6		
Parks & Recreation - Stonebridge Park	56.3		
Parks & Recreation - Whispering Pines		56.2	
Fire Rescue - Hanging Rock New Station			55.9
Parks & Recreation - Starkey Park			55.8
Fire Rescue - Station Renovations		55.3	
Information Technology - Server Replacement		55.1	
Parks & Recreation - Green Hill Park Phase III			55.0
Parks & Recreation - Walrond Park Phase III		54.7	
General Services - Recycling Trailers	54.2		
Parks & Recreation - Goode Park	54.2		
Information Technology - Disaster Recovery Hot Site	54.1		
Information Technology - Enterprise Network Security	54.0		
Library - Circulation Self-Checkout System	54.0		
Greenway Development - Mudlick Creek Greenway		53.8	
Parks & Recreation - Camp Roanoke	53.6		
General Services - Renovations to Service Center			53.3
Parks & Recreation - Hollins Park	52.1		
Information Technology - Computer Network Infrastructure Upgrade		51.9	
Parks & Recreation - Vinyard Park Phase III		50.7	
Community Development - GIS - New Server	49.0		
Fire Rescue - Station Fuel Control System	48.9		
Parks & Recreation - Northside High Tennis Court Restoration	48.8		
Police - Bomb Disposal Unit	48.7		
Information Technology - Voice Over IP		48.4	
Parks & Recreation - Family Water Park			47.9
Police - In Service Training Facility	47.7		
Parks & Recreation - Spring Hollow Park			46.2
Community Development - GIS - New Color Scanner/Printer	46.0		
Information Technology - Lawson HR/Payroll Enhancement	44.3		